

SCHAFKOPF LAW, LLC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

June 5, 2018

U.S. District Court, ED of PA Office of the Clerk of Court U.S. Courthouse 601 Market Street, Room 2609 Philadelphia, PA 19106

Re: Jonathan D. Josey v City of Philadelphia et al

To Whom It May Concern:

Enclosed please find one (1) original and one (1) copy of Plaintiff's Civil Action Complaint, along with a CD containing a pdf version of same and a check in the amount of \$400.00, in regards to the above captioned matter.

Kindly file the original Complaint and return a time-stamped copy to the undersigned along with the Civil Action Summonses.

Sincerely,

My Jan Gary Schafkopf, Esq.

MILDENBERG LAW FIRM

Brian R. Mildenberg, Esq. Attorney ID No. 84861 1735 Market St., Suite 3750 Philadelphia, PA 19103 215-545-4870 Fax: 215-545-4871 Attorney for Plaintiffs

WEISBERG LAW

Matthew B. Weisberg, Esq. Attorney ID No. 85570 7 South Morton Ave. Morton, PA 19070 610-690-0801 Fax: 610-690-0880 Attorney for Plaintiffs

SCHAFKOPF LAW, LLC

Gary Schafkopf, Esq.
Attorney ID No. 83362
11 Bala Ave.
Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004
610-664-5200 Ext 104
Fax: 888-238-1334
Attorney for Plaintiffs

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

:

JONATHAN D. JOSEY

C/O Weisberg Law 7 South Morton Ave Morton, PA 19070

CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiff,

DOCKET NO.

v.

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA d/b/a PHILADELPHIA POLICE

DEPARTMENT 1515 Arch St, 16th FL, Philadelphia, PA 19102 JURY TRIAL OF TWELVE (12)

JURORS DEMANDED

and

JOHN DOES 1-10

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

PARTIES JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- Plaintiff, Jonathan D. Josey, is an adult individual who is a Lieutenant for the
 Philadelphia Police Department and resides in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

 Plaintiff can be served care of her attorneys at the above-captioned address.
- 2. Defendant, City of Philadelphia, doing business as the Philadelphia Police Department ("PPD"), is a municipality, duly organized and existing under the laws of the

- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with an address for service at the above captioned address.
- 3. Defendants, John Does 1-10, is a moniker/fictitious name for individuals and entities currently unknown but will be substituted when known, as affiliated, associated or liable hereunder for the reasons set forth below or inferred therefrom. Each of these parties are incorporated as Defendants in each and every count and averment listed above and below.
- 4. This Court has jurisdiction and venue is appropriate in this judicial district because the facts complained of herein occurred in this judicial district, and this Complaint arises under the laws of the United States and seeks redress for violations of federal laws.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 5. Lt. Jonathan Josey has been employed by the Philadelphia Police Department since 1993.
- 6. Lt Josey had a stellar career in law enforcement until he was wrongfully terminated by the Department following an altercation with Ms. Aida Guzman following the Puerto Rican Day Parade on September 30, 2012.
- 7. Lt. Josey along with 721 other officers had been assigned to police the "after party" of the Puerto Rican Day Parade.
- 8. The "after party" has been described "control chaos," the police were advised that infractions that would normally result in arrests should be ignored unless they posed a serious threat to life or property.
- It was during the 'after party" that Lt Josey was sprayed with liquid by either attendee
 Aida Guzman or some else.

- 10. A small part of the confrontation between Lt. Josey and Ms. Guzman was captured on cell phone video and posted to social media.
- 11. In the video Lt. Josey can be seen confronting Ms. Guzman however it is unclear how Ms. Guzman ended up on the ground.
- 12. Ms. Guzman was subsequently charged with disorderly conduct.
- 13. The cell phone video was then broadcast internationally and Lt. Josey was accused of engaging in police brutality.
- 14. Under pressure from the media then Commissioner Charles Ramsey reviewed the video and concluded that Lt. Josey had used excessive force and that Lt. Josey violated the Police Department's Disciplinary Code by making false statements in various documents relating to Guzman's arrest.
- 15. On or about October 4, 2012 Lt. Josey was suspended and issued a Notice of Intention to Dismiss from the Philadelphia Police Department.
- 16. On or about November 1, 2012 Lt. Josey was terminated.
- 17. The Fraternal Order of Police immediately filed a grievance on Lt. Josey's behalf.
- 18. A grievance hearing was held on June 24-25, 2013 before an arbitrator.
- 19. On or about August 10, 2013, the arbitrator issued his decision, finding the City lacked sufficient reason to terminate Lt. Josey and ordering Lt Josey be reinstated with backpay less interim earning.
- 20. Furthermore, the Police Department was to "revise Jonathan Josey's personnel record to delete all references to his November 1 2012, discharge to the maximum extent permitted under the governing law."

FACTS RELATING TO THE DENIAL OF PROMOTION

- 21. In early 2014 Lt. Josey became aware of a notice for promotional opportunities to the rank of Captain.
- 22. Lt. Josey took the written promotional exam issued by the Department and has his oral examination at the end of March or early April of 2014,
- 23. In June 2014 the list of candidates who were eligible for promotion to the rank of Captain was published.
- 24. Lt. Josey ranked 15 of 57 candidates with a final score of 85.875.
- 25. Given Lt. Josey's ranking amongst the candidate he was invited to be interviewed by the Promotional Review Board.
- 26. On the February 22, 2016 attended the interview.
- 27. The Promotional Review Board consisted of three (3) members; two Field Inspectors, Joel Dales and Anthony Washington and Chief Inspector Christopher J. Flacco.
- 28. During the course of the interview Chief Inspector Flacco asked Lt. Josey several questions about the September 2012 incident involving Aida Guzman.
- 29. Lt Josey, left the interview believing that his wrongful termination and subsequent reinstatement was being used against him and that he would not be promoted.
- Following the interview of all 10 candidates the Review Board issued its recommendations.
- 31. Lt. Josey was recommended for promotion by Inspectors Dales and Washington but was not recommended by Chief Inspector Flacco.
- 32. In his decision Chief Inspector Flacco blatantly stated "It is my belief that if promoted, the incident on 30 September 2012 involving Aida Guzman will have a detrimental long-

- term impact on the relationship between the Department and the community we serve as well as undermine his ability to command."
- 33. City Police Commissioner Ross elected to bypass Lt. Josey citing Chief Inspectors Flaceo's recommendations as a factor in his decision.
- 34. Despite having the underlying disciplinary action expunged from his record, the Department continues to consider same as part of his record and Lt. Josey continues to be denied promotions for which he qualified as a result of same.

COUNT I – VIOLATION OF FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT DUE PROCESS CLAUSES

- 35. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs as if fully set forth at length herein.
- 36. As a result of Defendants' actions as aforesaid, Defendants have denied Plaintiff the right to the same terms, conditions, privileges and benefits of his employment agreement with the City of Philadelphia Police Department, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
- 37. Plaintiff has been denied substantive and procedural due process under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the US Constitution.
- 38. Plaintiff continues to be harassed and retaliated against, and denied promotions for disciplinary action that has been expunged from his employment record, and been made to suffer humiliation and embarrassment, emotional distress, and have sustained damages for which recovery of compensatory damages may be had pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
- 39. Said harassment and retaliation and against Plaintiff is pervasive and regular.
- 40. Said harassment and retaliation has affected Plaintiffs to his detriment.
- 41. Said harassment and retaliation would detrimentally affect a reasonable person under similar circumstances.

- 42. Said harassment and retaliation has caused a hostile work environment.
- 43. Said harassment and retaliation exacerbated the already hostile work environment to the point of a crisis.
- 44. Said violations were done intentionally and/or knowingly with malice or reckless indifference, and warrant the imposition of punitive damages.
- 45. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Plaintiff has suffered the damages and losses set forth herein and have incurred attorneys' fees and costs.
- 46. Plaintiff is suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable injury and monetary damages as a result of Defendants' retaliatory acts unless and until this Court grants the relief requested herein.
- 47. The wrongful acts and conduct of Defendants were done with deliberate indifference to the statutory and constitutional rights of Plaintiffs.
- 48. As such, Plaintiff has and continues to suffer damages as set forth herein.

RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff seeks damages and legal and equitable relief in connection with Defendants' improper conduct and specifically prays that this Court grant the following relief to Plaintiffs:

- a) declaring the acts and practices complained of herein to be in violation of Section
 1983;
- b) enjoining and permanently restraining the violations alleged herein;
- c) entering judgment against the Defendants and in favor of Plaintiffs in an amount to be determined;

 d) awarding compensatory damages to make Plaintiff whole for all lost earnings, earning capacity and benefits, past and future, which Plaintiffs have suffered or may suffer as a result of Defendants' improper conduct;

e) awarding compensatory damages for Plaintiffs for past and future pain and suffering, emotional upset, mental anguish, humiliation, and loss of life's pleasures, which Plaintiffs have and continue to suffer as a result of Defendants' improper conduct

f) awarding punitive damages to Plaintiffs;

g) awarding Plaintiffs such other damages as are appropriate under Section 1983

h) awarding Plaintiffs the costs of suit, attorneys' fees; and expert fees and other; and

 i) granting such other and further relief as this Court may deem just, proper, or equitable including other equitable and injunctive relief providing restitution for past violations and preventing future violations.

Respectfully Submitted,

WEISBERG LAW

BY: /s/ Matthew Weisberg

MATTHEW B. WEISBERG, ESQ

DATED: 6-4-18

MILDENBERG LAW FIRM

BY: <u>/s/ Brian R Mildenberg</u> BRIAN R. MILDENBERG, ESQ

DATED: 6-4-18

SCHAEKODE LAW LIC

BY: <u>/s//Gary/Schafkopf</u>

GARY SCHAFKOPF, ESQ.

DATED: 6-4-18

MILDENBERG LAW FIRM

Brian R. Mildenberg, Esq. Attorney ID No. 84861 1735 Market St., Suite 3750 Philadelphia, PA 19103 215-545-4870 Fax: 215-545-4871 Attorney for Plaintiffs

WEISBERG LAW

Matthew B. Weisberg, Esq. Attorney ID No. 85570 7 South Morton Ave. Morton, PA 19070 610-690-0801 Fax: 610-690-0880 Attorney for Plaintiffs

SCHAFKOPF LAW, LLC

Gary Schafkopf, Esq. Attorney ID No. 83362 11 Bala Ave. Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004 610-664-5200 Ext 104 Fax: 888-238-1334 Attorney for Plaintiffs

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

C/O Weisberg Law 7 South Morton Ave Morton, PA 19070 Plaintiff, V. CITY OF PHILADELPHIA d/b/a PHILADELPHIA POLICE DEPARTMENT 1515 Arch St, 16 th FL Philadelphia, PA 19102 and JOHN DOES 1-10 Defendants.	JONATHAN D. JOSEY	
Morton, PA 19070 Plaintiff, v. CITY OF PHILADELPHIA d/b/a PHILADELPHIA POLICE DEPARTMENT 1515 Arch St, 16 th FL Philadelphia, PA 19102 and JOHN DOES 1-10	C/O Weisberg Law	:
Plaintiff, V. CITY OF PHILADELPHIA d/b/a PHILADELPHIA POLICE DEPARTMENT 1515 Arch St, 16 th FL Philadelphia, PA 19102 and JOHN DOES 1-10	7 South Morton Ave	: CIVIL ACTION
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA d/b/a PHILADELPHIA POLICE DEPARTMENT 1515 Arch St, 16 th FL Philadelphia, PA 19102 and JOHN DOES 1-10	Morton, PA 19070	;
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA d/b/a PHILADELPHIA POLICE DEPARTMENT 1515 Arch St, 16 th FL Philadelphia, PA 19102 and JOHN DOES 1-10	D(=:4:60	POCKETTALO
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA d/b/a PHILADELPHIA POLICE DEPARTMENT 1515 Arch St, 16 th FL Philadelphia, PA 19102 and JOHN DOES 1-10	•	: DUCKET NO.
d/b/a PHILADELPHIA POLICE DEPARTMENT 1515 Arch St, 16 th FL Philadelphia, PA 19102 and JOHN DOES 1-10	ν,	;
d/b/a PHILADELPHIA POLICE DEPARTMENT 1515 Arch St, 16 th FL Philadelphia, PA 19102 and JOHN DOES 1-10	CHOIL OF DAYS A DET DAYS	:
DEPARTMENT 1515 Arch St, 16 th FL Philadelphia, PA 19102 and JOHN DOES 1-10		:
DEPARTMENT 1515 Arch St, 16 th FL Philadelphia, PA 19102 and JOHN DOES 1-10	d/b/a PHILADELPHIA POLICE	: JURY TRIAL OF TWELVE (12)
1515 Arch St, 16 th FL Philadelphia, PA 19102 and JOHN DOES 1-10	DEPARTMENT	
and JOHN DOES 1-10	1515 Arch St, 16th FL	:
and JOHN DOES 1-10	Philadelphia, PA 19102	1
JOHN DOES 1-10		•
JOHN DOES 1-10	and	•
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	JOHN DOFS 1_10	•
Detendants. :		;
•	Detendants.	:
•		:

DECLARATION

I, Jonathan Josey, plaintiff in the above action, have read the Complaint in the above captioned matter and declare under of penalty perjury under the laws of the United States of America that all allegations of fact therein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

BY: _			
DATEI):		

MILDENBERG LAW FIRM Brian R. Mildenberg, Esq. Attorney ID No. 84861 1735 Market St., Suite 3750 Philadelphia, PA 19103

215-545-4870 Fax: 215-545-4871 Attorney for Plaintiffs WEISBERG LAW
Matthew B. Weisberg, Esq.
Attorney ID No. 85570
7 South Morton Ave.
Morton, PA 19070
610-690-0801

Fax: 610-690-0880

Attorney for Plaintiffs

SCHAFKOPF LAW, LLC Gary Schafkopf, Esq. Attorney ID No. 83362 11 Bala Ave. Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004 610-664-5200 Ext 104 Fax: 888-238-1334 Attorney for Plaintiffs

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JONATHAN D. JOSEY

C/O Weisberg Law 7 South Morton Ave Morton, PA 19070

: CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiff,

DOCKET NO.

V.

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA d/b/a PHILADELPHIA POLICE

DEPARTMENT 1515 Arch St, 16th FL. Philadelphia, PA 19102 JURY TRIAL OF TWELVE (12)

: JURORS DEMANDED

and

JOHN DOES 1-10

Defendants.

DECLARATION

I, Jonathan Josey, plaintiff in the above action, have read the Complaint in the above captioned matter and declare under of penalty perjury under the laws of the United States of America that all allegations of fact therein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge,

information, and belief.

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the papers as required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the papers as required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court.

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	ionet sileet. (BEE Warner	JIOMS ON NEXT THOSE	71 111B1-0	DEFENDANT	ΓS				
Jonathan D. Josey			City of Philadelphia & John Does 1-10						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Philadelphia (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Schafkopf Law, 11 Bala Ave Bala Cynwyd PA 19004, 610-664-52 Matthew B. Weisberg, 7 South Morton Ave Morton PA 19070; 610-690-0801		County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.							
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in C	One Box Only)	III. CI	<u>I</u> TIZENSHIP OF	PRINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in	One Box j	for Plaintif
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	▶ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	1	(For Diversity Cases Only on of This State	PTF DEF	Incorporated or Pr of Business In T		or Defende PTF 🗇 4	ant) DEF
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	D 2 D 2	Incorporated and I of Business In A		□ 5	□ 5
			1	en or Subject of a reign Country	O 3 O 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box O		4 30	Madaaso Wood Saa		here for: Nature o			
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise □ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 370 Other Praud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability 385 Property Damage Product Liability 386 Property Damage Product Liability 387 Property Damage Product Liability 388 Property Damage Product Liability 388 Property Damage Product Liability 389 Property Damage Product Liability 380 Property	1	EARCH 5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 88 0 Other 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Applicati 5 Other Immigration Actions	1 422 Appe 423 With 28 U 423 With 28 U 423 With 28 U 424 Copy 380 Paten 835 Paten 840 Trade 861 Hiad 863 DIW 864 SSID 865 RSI (SC 157 TYRIGHTS rights at at - Abbreviated Drug Application emark SECURITY (1395ff) Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g)) TAXSUTS 5 (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	375 False Ch 376 Qui Tam 3729(a); 400 State Re: 410 Antitrust 430 Banks ar 450 Commer 460 Deportat 470 Racketee Corrupt (480 Consum 490 Cable/Sa 850 Securitie Exchang 891 Agricultu 893 Environn 895 Freedom Act 896 Arbitratie 899 Administ	aims Act (31 USC) apportion t t d Bankin ce ion or Influenc Organizati or Credit tt TV ss/Commo ss/Commo sull Acts mental Mat of Inform on trative Pro ew or Ap Decision tionality of	ment g ced and ions dities/ ctions tters nation
▼ 1 Original □ 2 Rea	moved from	Remanded from E Appellate Court tute under which you as	Reop	(speci	her District	6 Multidistri Litigation Transfer	ict 🗆 8	Multidis Litigatio Direct Fil	trict n - le
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	N 42 U.S.C. Section Brief description of ca	1983		<u>-</u>			loyment reco	ord_	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.			V DI	EMAND \$		HECK YES only I JRY DEMAND:	if demanded in Yes	complair □ No	ıt:
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	T NUMBER			
DATE 06/05/2018		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY O	F RECORD					-
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	10UNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	GE		

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below. United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box. Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
 Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.
 - Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.
 - Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.
 - Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing
 - Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
 - Multidistrict Litigation Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.
 - Multidistrict Litigation Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket.

 PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7. Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statue.
- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

 Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.

 Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

Case 2:18-cv-02361-MSG Document 1 Filed 06/06/18 Page 14 of 16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA --- DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar. Address of Plaintiff: C/O Weisberg Law 7 South Morton Ave Morton PA 19070 Address of Defendant: 1515 Arch Street, 16th Floor Philadelphia PA 19102 Philadelphia Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space) Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock? NoX Yes 🗆 (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) Note Yesu Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Date Terminated: Case Number: Judge Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes□ 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously Yes□ terminated action in this court? 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? No X CIVIL: (Place / in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1.

Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2.

Airplane Personal Injury 2. D FELA 3.

Assault, Defamation 3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury 4.

Marine Personal Injury 4. □ Antitrust 5. D Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 5. Patent 6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 6. □ Labor-Management Relations 7. X Civil Rights 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability - Asbestos 8. □ Habeas Corpus 9. □ All other Diversity Cases 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. □ All other Federal Ouestion Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) Gary Schafkopf counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought. 83362 DATE: 6-5-18 Attorney I.D.# Attorney/at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.

DATE: 6-5-18

CIV. 609 (5/2012)

83362

Attorney I.D.#

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Jonathan Josey	:	CIVIL ACTION
v.	; ;	
City of Philadelphia et	al :	NO.
plaintiff shall complete a Car filing the complaint and serve side of this form.) In the e designation, that defendant s	se Management Track Design a copy on all defendants. (See went that a defendant does thall, with its first appearance ties, a Case Management Trackers the case should be assigned.	,
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases b	orought under 28 U.S.C. § 2	241 through § 2255. ()
	equesting review of a decisi ying plaintiff Social Security	on of the Secretary of Health
(c) Arbitration – Cases requi	red to be designated for arbi	itration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. ()
(d) Asbestos – Cases involvi exposure to asbestos.	ng claims for personal injur	y or property damage from
	complex and that need spec de of this form for a detailed	ial or intense management by d explanation of special ()
(1) Standard Wanagement —	Cases that do not fan into ar	by one of the other tracks. (\times)
6-5-18	Gary Schafkopf	Plaintiff
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for
610-664-5200	888-283-1334	gary@schaflaw.com
Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address

(Civ. 660) 10/02

Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan Section 1:03 - Assignment to a Management Track

- (a) The clerk of court will assign cases to tracks (a) through (d) based on the initial pleading.
- (b) In all cases not appropriate for assignment by the clerk of court to tracks (a) through (d), the plaintiff shall submit to the clerk of court and serve with the complaint on all defendants a case management track designation form specifying that the plaintiff believes the case requires Standard Management or Special Management. In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a case management track designation form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.
- (c) The court may, on its own initiative or upon the request of any party, change the track assignment of any case at any time.
- (d) Nothing in this Plan is intended to abrogate or limit a judicial officer's authority in any case pending before that judicial officer, to direct pretrial and trial proceedings that are more stringent than those of the Plan and that are designed to accomplish cost and delay reduction.
- (e) Nothing in this Plan is intended to supersede Local Civil Rules 40.1 and 72.1, or the procedure for random assignment of Habeas Corpus and Social Security cases referred to magistrate judges of the court.

SPECIAL MANAGEMENT CASE ASSIGNMENTS (See §1.02 (e) Management Track Definitions of the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan)

Special Management cases will usually include that class of cases commonly referred to as "complex litigation" as that term has been used in the Manuals for Complex Litigation. The first manual was prepared in 1969 and the Manual for Complex Litigation Second, MCL 2d was prepared in 1985. This term is intended to include cases that present unusual problems and require extraordinary treatment. See §0.1 of the first manual. Cases may require special or intense management by the court due to one or more of the following factors: (1) large number of parties; (2) large number of claims or defenses; (3) complex factual issues; (4) large volume of evidence; (5) problems locating or preserving evidence; (6) extensive discovery; (7) exceptionally long time needed to prepare for disposition; (8) decision needed within an exceptionally short time; and (9) need to decide preliminary issues before final disposition. It may include two or more related cases. Complex litigation typically includes such cases as antitrust cases; cases involving a large number of parties or an unincorporated association of large membership; cases involving requests for injunctive relief affecting the operation of large business entities; patent cases; copyright and trademark cases; common disaster cases such as those arising from aircraft crashes or marine disasters; actions brought by individual stockholders; stockholder's derivative and stockholder's representative actions; class actions or potential class actions; and other civil (and criminal) cases involving unusual multiplicity or complexity of factual issues. See §0.22 of the first Manual for Complex Litigation and Manual for Complex Litigation Second, Chapter 33.